



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,473	03/13/2006	Shinsuke Nakamura	Q93732	7790
23373	7590	02/13/2008		
SUGHRIE MION, PLLC			EXAMINER	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			FISCHER, JUSTIN R	
SUITE 800				
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/571,473	Applicant(s) NAKAMURA, SHINSUKE
	Examiner Justin R. Fischer	Art Unit 1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. .
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims as currently drafted require the presence of a maximum displacement point, wherein said point is defined as a point where the interference is maximum.

Additionally, as acknowledged by applicant (Page 3, 2nd Paragraph), "interference" is defined as being the difference in distance between the bottom of bead core and the bead base along the tire radial direction measured before and after mounting the bead portion on the rim. Thus, the following measurements occur in sequential order:

- (1) first radial distances between the bottom of the bead core and the bead base are measured,
- (2) tire is mounted on rim,
- (3) second radial distances between the bottom of bead core and the bead base are measured, and
- (4) comparing first and second radial distances to determine the location of the maximum displacement point.

The first and second radial distances are those distances that are measured between the bottom of the bead core and the bead base and thus, the maximum displacement point (location at which interference is a maximum) cannot be located outside of the width defined by the bottom of the bead core. It is noted that the claim language does not define the interference as the difference in radial distance between

the bead base and an associated point on a hypothetical line defined by the extension of the bottom of the bead core.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed January 23, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that there is no limitation that the interference be measured directly beneath the bead core. In particular, applicant points to Figure 2 and to Paragraph 20.

First, it is unclear what the dimension "t" refers to in Figure 2 (at bead toe) and applicant has not pointed to the original disclosure to describe this reference character. It appears to represent a distance between the hypothetical location of the bead base and the upper surface of the rim. This measurement is not analogous to "interference" as it does not represent a difference in radial distance between the bottom of the bead core and the bead base before and after mounting. Second, in regards to Paragraph 20, it is agreed that the entire bead base (regions within and outside bottom of bead core) is compressed after mounting on the rim. However, such a description does not suggest that the maximum displacement point can be located outside of a width defined by the bottom of the bead core. It is emphasized that the claims do not define the interference as the difference in radial distance between the bead base and an associated point on a hypothetical line defined by the extension of the bottom of the bead core. Any measurement taken outside of the width of the bottom of the bead core is not an "interference" measurement as defined by the original disclosure. For

example, a measurement between (a) a point on the bead base outward of the bead core and (b) the bottom of the bead core would not be a radial distance (it would be a diagonal measurement).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin R. Fischer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571) 272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Justin R Fischer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791